concentration of formulation market share;

(c) if so, what definition of high concentration of formulation market share has been taken;

(d) whether it is -a fact that another drug Metranidazole for same indication have a better spread of formulations but still the same have been covered under price control whereas Tinidazole exempted from price control;

(e) what are the reasons and which of the exclusion criteria is satisfied by Tini dazole; and

(f.) what steps have been taken to review the arbitrary exclusion of Tinidazole by Kelkar Committee ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETRO-CHEMICALS IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P. NAMGYAL) : (a) Sales turnover of formulations is not monitored" by this Ministry.

(h) and (c) The Kelkar Committee had also taken into account 'high concentration of formulation market share' while adopting exclusion criteria laid down by the Committee for inclusion of drugs under price control.

(d) to (f) Th© Kelkar Committee in its supplementary report had recommended for retention of Metronidazole under price control due to very high concentration of formulation market by two companies whereas there was no consensus in caise of Tinidazole for including this drug under price control.

Prices of formulations

1475. CHOWDHARY RAM SEWAK: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be plea-sed to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1594 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 8th May, 1989 and state;

(a) whether it is a fact that Sulphamoxole. Hydroprogesterone, Glipizide and Glybenclamide were all price controlled under DPCO, 1979; 529 RS—6.

(b) if so, what were the last prices fixed in respect to each of these drugs Under the said order;

(c) what w«re the last prices fixed for each formulations based on each drug under DPCO, 1979.

(d) whether it is a fact that no revision was possible under DPCO, 1987 without furnishing details in Form 2A;

(e) when and what are the prices furnished for these drugs under DPCO, 1987;

(f) what is the present price of each of these bulk drugs and formulations based on each;

(g) whether it is a fact that the turn=-over of each of these drugs' is more than Rupees fifty lacs per annum; and

(h) if so, on what basis these drugs have been price decontrolled?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTRY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P. NAMGYAL): (a) All drugs referred to in the question except Hydroprogesterone were price controlled under DPCO, 1979.

(h) , (c). (e) and (f) The required details to the extent possible will be collected and laid on the Table of the House.

(d) Yes, Sir.

(g) Sales turnover is not monitored.

(h) Out of the above three drugs, it has been decided to include Sulphamoxole under price controlled category as per the recommendations contained in the Supplementary Report of the Kelkar Commiitee.

Communication of the assessed amounts due from drug companies

1476. CHOWDHARY RAM SEWAK: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1607 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 8th May, 1989 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the special team has not submitted the report on the amounts due from all the companies involved in litigation in the Supreme Court;

(b) if so, what are the names of those companies and by when the report will be submitted;

(c) what are the names of drugs involved in each case;

(d) what are the names of drugs involved in which case the amount has been assessed and what is the quantity of each drug involved on which the amount upto 1983 has been assessed;

(e) whether it is a fact that there are still certain companies which are yet to be communicated the amounts assessed;

(f) if so, what are the details thereof and by when the amount will be communicated to them; and

(g) what is the break up of amount due in each case worked out upto 15th July, 1989 and how much has been recovered?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETRO-CHEMICALS IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P. NAMGYAL): (a) Yes Sir.

(b) to (g) AU the required details shall be collected and laid on the Table of the House after the work of the Special Team has been completed. *(See* Appendix CCI, Annexure No. 96)

Gas terminals at Bombay

1477. SHRl J. P JAVALI: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS be pleased to state;

(a) whether it is a fact that Government propose to locate two natural gas terminals, one at North of Bombay and the other at South of Bombay.

(b) whether Karnataka Government has requested the Central Government to lay the gas pipeline between Bombay and Mangalore and locate one of the two proposed natural gas terminals at Manga lore to solve that State's power problem; and

(c) if so, what aTe the details thereof and what is the Central Government's reaction thereto?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI BRAHM DUTT): (a) ONGC have set up one gas processing terminal at Uran in Maharashtra and another at Hazira in Gujarat.

(b) and (c) The Government of Karnataka have requested to lay a gas pipeline from Bombay High to the Southern Region and to establish a terminal in Mangalore port for import of LNG to set up gas based power project in the State.

As the gas currently available from Bombay High has been fully committed to various users, it would not be possible to supply gas to Karnataka State from Bombay High.

At present no LNG is being imported. LNG terminals would be required ia case LNG is imported in the future. A decision on import of LNG in future would be taken depending upon the techno-economic feasibility of such import, ary the request of the Karnataka Government would be kept in mind while deciding upon the locatio$_n$ of LNG terminals in case import of LNG is taken up in future.

Crude from USSR

1478. SHRi SURESH PACHOURI: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the USSR have not acceded to the request made by India for additional crude during the current financial year;

(b) if so, what are the reasons therefor; and